



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

will make it practically impossible for them to be left out this time.

We shall await with great interest the response of the powers to our government's Second Note, and shall expect in due time to see the definite arrangements for the meeting completed.

War as an Argument for Peace.

In an editorial written while the peace meetings following the Boston Congress were going on, the assertion was made by a daily paper in one of our leading cities that war itself is the best argument for peace.

The utterance was inspired by the murderous fighting which had just taken place in Manchuria, as contrasted with the urgent moral appeals being made at the time by the Peace Congress delegates for the abolition of war and the establishment of permanent concord among the nations. The belching, spitting guns at Liaoyang, mowing down men "like oats and rye," seemed to the author of the quoted words to outdo in convincing eloquence the men and women who based their arguments against war upon reason, humanity, economy and common sense.

It must be confessed that there is a good deal of truth in the paper's declaration. No other argument against war than war itself ought to be necessary. A battlefield, during and after the fighting, is about the most appalling, loathsome and mournful sight ever witnessed on the face of the earth. It would be considered incredible, if it were not so common, that a man should look for a single time on so grewsome and utterly inhuman a spectacle, or even read a description of it, and not be turned at once and forever into an irreconcilable enemy of war. That men can look on it and then condone it, and even glorify it, is more incomprehensible still.

Not a few of the leading advocates of peace of the past century were driven into their open arraignment of war, and their efforts to suppress it, by what they had witnessed on the field of carnage. It is most discreditable to humanity that the number was not much larger. It argues a very low state of moral perception and purpose on the part of the average masses of men that they can be cognizant of such deeds as those which have been done recently about Port Arthur and not flock by tens of thousands to the standards of peace.

But powerful as this argument is in itself, or would be, if men were morally at themselves, we do not rate it as high as is done by the newspaper to which we have referred. Its force is purely incidental. The writer of the sentiment would certainly not advise the getting up of a great and desolating war in order to convince a lot of intellectual and moral dullards that war is a miserably bad business, below the worthiness of beings claiming to be possessed of conscience and intelligence. He would

doubtless allow that history has furnished proof enough of the soundness of his thesis, without the necessity of any further development of the argument.

No, the greatest argument for peace is not war, but peace itself, just as the strongest argument for soberness is not the intoxicated man lolling in the corner of a street car, hiccupping and gibbering, but the sober man by his side, sitting upright and decent, and carrying home in his pocket his hard-earned wages to his happy wife and children. There is nothing more beautiful and noble in this earthly habitation of ours than two strong, healthy men, two families, living side by side on the same street, or on two adjoining farms, in entire friendliness and confidence, each seeking always to contribute to the other's prosperity and happiness and good reputation. No number of miserable duels fought openly or in some hidden spot, no number of despicable street fights or saloon brawls could prove so effectively as these two families living in peace that men ought not to curse and beat each other, but to live together in friendship and goodwill.

One might make the same observation with even greater emphasis in regard to two great cities like New York and Philadelphia, or London and Paris, bound together by innumerable ties of travel, commerce and friendly social intercourse, so that their lives and interests become in important respects one. The active coöperative peace that exists between two such cities is one of the finest attainments of our civilization, surpassed only by that of the larger national or international community of which they constitute a part. Dr. E. E. Hale has often declared the United States to be the greatest peace society ever formed. Peace society is hardly the right word; it is more than that, it is a great pacific union of states and cities and communities and men and women living together in concord and trust and fellowship. This United States, this civilized community of eighty millions of people living together in comparative harmony, over a territory greater than the Roman empire ever covered, furnishes a mightier argument for universal and perpetual peace than all the bloody wars that have been fought since the days of Cain.

Japan and Russia at war for eleven months, during which they have killed and wounded two hundred thousand of their citizens, made countless widows and orphans, and squandered on death and ruin nearly seven hundred millions of their people's money, have indeed given us a distressingly weighty argument in behalf of peace. It is some satisfaction to know that it has been heard, and that it seems likely to be heeded.

But during the same period, England and France have been making an argument for peace in an infinitely nobler form and of an altogether different

order. They have strengthened all the bonds of friendship between them. They have come to agreement about all their old disputes. They have pledged themselves for a period of years to refer to the Hague Court any controversies that may arise between them. Their citizens have ceased berating and have begun to talk in a brotherly and appreciative way about one another. Their rulers have gone from capital to capital spreading the contagion of the new spirit. Their vast commerce has gone on undisturbed, and their homes on both sides of the Channel have remained unbroken and happy.

This large, ever active, complex, continuous pacific life of two or more great contiguous communities of men, whether within the same national limits or separated by boundary lines, is the supreme argument for peace everywhere and among all men, for it is peace, and peace on a large and permanent scale.

Justice and Peace.

A good deal has been said recently about the relation of peace to justice. In his message to Congress last month, and in other late utterances, President Roosevelt has employed the expression, "the peace of justice," a phrase which has been eagerly caught up by a certain class of persons and seems likely to have a considerable run. Dr. Felix Adler, in the *Ethical Record* for December, has complained that the peace societies have neglected the idea of justice, and that therefore he has not been able to join any one of them. Mrs. Julia Ward Howe, at the Boston Peace Congress, entered the same complaint in a very gentle and gracious way. She had not heard, she said, the word justice used in connection with the peace movement as frequently as it ought to be used.

The subject is, indeed, an important one, and utterances about it ought not to be flung around haphazard, but should be made with great care.

Dr. Adler is a strong and enlightening thinker and his criticisms are usually well grounded. But his reflection upon the peace societies in this case shows an extraordinary lack of historical information. From the very first the peace societies were among the foremost advocates of justice. They have always pleaded for and defended the fundamental rights of men of all races and classes. Their leaders in the early part of last century were all bold and untiring opponents of slavery. Worcester, Channing, Ladd, Whittier, Garrison, Ballou, Sumner, Walker, Burritt, William Jay, the anti-slavery leaders, were all members of peace societies. Dr. Adler knows that these were the bravest champions of justice. In England the great leaders, Sturge and Bright and Cobden and Richard, the protagonists of justice, were, every one of them, in the Peace Society. And what greater advocate of justice ever existed than Victor Hugo, who presided over the Peace Congress of 1849?

We are acquainted with the rank and file of the peace society men in all countries to-day, and we do not hesitate to say that there is no body of persons living who are more loyal than they to justice in all the sacred circle of its varied claims. They have been among the first, often the very first, to declare against the racial, the political, the social, the industrial injustices, which have from time to time dishonored our civilization. Year after year the peace congresses, whose leaders are the prominent men in the peace societies, have asked for justice for Armenia, for Macedonia, for the weak and backward races, for the small nations and incipient popular governments. They lifted up their voices against the injustices of the cormorant powers towards China which brought on the Boxer uprising. The men who led the arraignment of the British government for its high-handed conduct toward the Boer republics, and got themselves mobbed in the meetings of protest which they organized, were largely the peace society leaders. In this country no stronger protests have been made against the new policy of the nation with its attendant injustices to weak peoples than those of the peace societies. The fact is that the peace societies as a whole have gone beyond anybody else in the completeness of their demands for justice everywhere, and they might just as appropriately have been called justice societies.

The peace societies are aware, and always have been, that there can never be real peace where and so long as serious injustice exists. For the so-called peace of slavery,—of repression, of weakness and cowardice, of military domination, and what-not,—is not peace but essentially war. No peace society man has ever pleaded for such peace. But they are aware also, for history has written the lesson large on a thousand pages, that some other means than violence must be resorted to if justice is to be established. There are two things about war that seem to them perfectly clear. The first is, that war, whose law is might not right, never *per se* decides what is just, but only, all things considered, which is the stronger of the two belligerents. They know that in history the decision of battle has been much oftener on the side of wrong than of right. The second thing is, that war, any war, always in its very nature necessarily inflicts a large amount of injustice. It crushes the innocent with the guilty. It drags multitudes of unwilling men to its slaughter grounds. It makes countless widows and orphans, and leaves them often to life-long suffering and misery. It robs the aged and helpless of their natural supporters. It lays heavy burdens of taxation upon the masses of the people which they ought not to have imposed upon them. And in addition to these forms of gross injustice, it sows the seeds of other wars with their harvests of injustice. The truth is, they know that